Signature

Date

Printed name

Christopher J. Reckamp

January 3, 2006

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number

10/700,173

TRANSMITTAL			Filing Date	November 3, 2003		
FORM			First Named Inventor	Raj K. Gowda		
			Art Unit	3673		
. (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Examiner Name	Alexander Grosz		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission			Attorney Docket Number	35606.00.0002		
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)						
	Fee Transmittal Form		Orawing(s)		After Allowance Communication to TC	
	Fee Attached	الاا	icensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences	
	Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement		Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence A Ferminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)  Landscape Table on CD	ddress	Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)  Proprietary Information  Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below):  -return postcard	
	Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)  Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application  Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	Remar	ks			
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT						
Firm Name Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.						

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature Date Christine A. Wright January 3, 2006 Typed or printed name

Reg. No.

34,414

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.





## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Title: INFLATABLE CUSHION CELL WITH DIAGONAL SEAL STRUCTURE

Serial No.: 10/700,173

Filing Date: November 3, 2003

Confirmation No.: 3662

Examiner: Alexander Grosz

Art Unit: 3673

Docket No.: 35606.00.0002

Certificate of First Class Mailing
I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents,
P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450, on this date

1-3-06

Christine A. V

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 1, 2005, Applicant responds as follows.

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1-20, 23 and 24 are pending. Claims 21 and 22 have already been withdrawn based on a previous restriction requirement.

The office action attempts to restrict claims to three allegedly different inventions and groups the claims as follows: Group I – Claims 1-12; Group II – Claims 13-16; and Group III – Claims 17-20, 23 and 24. The reason for the alleged distinctness is that the inventions are related as combination and subcombination in that the combination as claimed "does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability." (See Restriction Requirement, page 2). However, Applicant respectfully submits that it appears that the claims have been misapprehended since each of the pending independent claims requires the subcombination of claim 1 and as such, the first element of the test applied in the restriction requirement is not met